

during the decade and a half since the CIA was established to coordinate the work of all governmental units which gather and evaluate information about what is going on all over the world.

There has never been any controversy over the claim that there has to be a certain amount of cloak-and-dagger secrecy about such an agency. Few ever questioned the contention that it could not accomplish its task if it had to work in the glare of Congressional revelation.

Hence, there is acceptance that Congress as a whole shouldn't even know how much money it is voting to the CIA. The agency's funds are tucked into unexplained items in appropriations for other governmental departments. No effort is made by most members of Congress to find out how many people CIA has around the world. It is accepted by most of them that the agency has more employees and spends more money than does the State Department.

'Outrank' Ambassadors?

Those facts lend support to the claim that agents of the CIA, through their secret activities, are more influential in many foreign countries than is the ambassador from the United States. It lends support to the charge that the CIA agents have more influence on the formulation of foreign policy than does the State Department.

For years, there has been a demand for the establishment of a "watchdog committee" of Congress to monitor the CIA. A few years ago, such a move was spearheaded by Mike Mansfield, now the Senate majority leader. Like other such efforts, the Mansfield move came to nothing.

The power of the CIA to have an important voice in formulating foreign policy disturbed many senators when John Foster Dulles was secretary of state and his brother, Allen W. Dulles, was director of the intelligence agency.

Unhappiness over the power of the agency reached a peak with the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Its critics charged that CIA took the direction of foreign affairs out of the hands of two presidents and, with

the help of the generals and admirals, led the nation to the abortive Cuban venture.

Adverse criticism of the CIA is typified by the title of a book written in 1964 by David Wise and Thomas Ross, "The Invisible Government."

Details of the current effort to give the CIA more supervision are not as complicated as they sound. Actually, there already are three "watchdog" committees. One is the group, already mentioned, composed of seven senators from the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. There is a similar eight-member committee in the House of Representatives.

In addition, there is a Citizens Advisory Committee of eight members. It is headed by Clark Clifford, who, ever since he was Harry S. Truman's White House counsel, has been flitting between a prosperous Washington law practice and chores for whomever happens to be president.

The current proposal which has stirred up all the bitterness is sponsored by Minnesota's McCarthy. It proposes that the current Senate watchdog committee be revamped to give membership to three senators from the Foreign Relations Committee, three from the Armed Services Committee and three from the Appropriations Committee.

McCarthy and his supporters won the first round of their fight. They got the Foreign Relations Committee to approve the proposal by a vote of 14 to 5. The next and more perilous stage would be when and if the Senate gets a chance to act on it.

The first danger facing the proposal is that Sen. Russell will move to send the measure to the Armed Services Committee, of which he is chairman. The argument for such a referral is that because the legislation creating the CIA, along with the Defense Department, was handled by the Armed Services Committee, all matters affecting it must also go to Armed Services.

Should the measure go to Russell's committee, it will receive a prompt

burial. If the Senate votes with McCarthy and Fulbright in refusing to send the bill to Armed Services, there still is the problem of getting the Democratic Policy Committee to clear it for floor action.

In that connection, it is worth noting that one of the 14 members of the Foreign Relations Committee who voted to bring out the measure was Majority Leader Mansfield. Another was Russell Long, assistant leader, although the Louisiana senator is classified among the chamber's more vigorous hawks.

Charge From Lausche

All five who opposed putting members of their own committee on the watchdog group have been associated with the hawks. They were Democrats Frank J. Lausche of Ohio and Stuart Symington of Missouri, along with Republicans Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, Frank Carlson of Kansas and Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota.

Lausche backed up his vote with an assertion on the Senate floor that while members of Russell's watchdog committee were noted for their refusal to give out confidential information received from the CIA, the members of Foreign Relations were known for their willingness to leak vital data.

Members of the present seven-man committee, which Lausche praised for being tight-lipped, are Democrats Russell, Symington, Stennis and Carl Hayden of Arizona, along with Republicans Everett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Margaret Chase Smith of Maine and Milton Young of North Dakota. Mrs. Smith will succeed Saltonstall as the top Republican on Armed Services.

Her name has been used to support the contention that Sen. Russell has permitted the CIA to say who shall or shall not sit on the watchdog committee. Russell has denied that accusation vigorously. But the point has been made that, despite her seniority, Mrs. Smith was kept off the group until it would have been embarrassing all around to discriminate against a senator who would be chairman of the committee if her party won a majority of seats.